

96-98

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Jeff Bower
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Apr 24, 2003 1:36 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Jeff Bower (jeff.bower@demandmanager.com) writes:

Line sharing saves consumers millions of dollars each year. Please save it!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.228.216.106
Remote IP address: 12.228.216.106

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

SUNSHINE PERIOD

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-98

SUNSHINE PERIOD

From: John Royer
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, May 1, 2003 4:24 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

John Royer (johnney_royer@yahoo.com) writes:

SHAME ON YOU FOR KILLING Line Sharing - I am screwed in Montana! Thanks for nothing!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.227.129.203
Remote IP address: 12.227.129.203

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2003

State of Montana, via State Commissioner
Office of the Attorney General

96-98

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Sean Belanger
Date: Wed, Apr 23, 2003 4:48 PM
Subject: from the CEO of Paradyne, please read

SUNSHINE PERIOD

Excuse the email. I am sure you get many.
I am CEO of Paradyne Networks
We are equipment provider not a CLEC.
We trade on the NAS PDYN. I am very concerned about the latest FCC ruling in regard to line sharing.

Over the past 5 years we have seen the incredible failure of CLECS offering broadband services. The RBOCS through design or their own slowness to change caused considerable challenges in installation process and expense. One of the relief's was line sharing.

The elimination of line sharing is the equivalent of putting the last nail in the coffin or kicking em when their down. The RBOC's don't even care any more but FCC in their wisdom has determined line sharing needs to go away.

Japan has incredible success story going on with competition, deregulation and line sharing. Yahoo! Japan or SBB (Softbank BB) is rolling out broadband to anyone that wants it in Japan. They have a cooperative relationship with NTT. They share lines from NTT at \$1.50 per month. They sell broadband at \$20 per month and have installed 2 million customers.

Give the remaining CLECS a chance. I heard there is some positive talk of implementation versus the ruling or even a reversal of this particular ruling. I hope so.

I personally have been engaged with Rhythms, Covad, Northpoint, Connect South, NAS, HarvardNet, ChoiceOne and others. Companies like Covad are still standing but kicking them again does nothing for competition and certainly does not fuel the RBOC to deploy broadband. The RBOC fear of CLECS is long gone. What was the rational in elimination of line sharing?

RBOCS say they can not make money at broadband? Did they say the same thing about voice? The data infrastructure they are installing is 1/10 the cost of the voice infrastructure they installed and the monthly bill is double or triple.

RBOCS say they can not bring broadband to everyone when Yahoo Japan and hundreds of IOC are giving it to all. Manufactures like Paradyne are building small DSLAMS designed to go into small CO's, RTs, and rural markets. Paradyne in Particular builds a long loop reach DSL that goes us to 40,000ft from a CO. (used by Yahoo and hundreds of IOCS). The product is blocked from use by the standards bodies and in particular Alcatel a french manufacture who dominates the RBOC deployments.

Give what's left of the CLECS a break and look around at the rest of the world and see the models that are working with CLECS..
Look at the small independents where broadband is being delivered to all with the same deployment challenge as an RBOC.

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Thanks for listening.

Sean Belanger
CEO
Paradyne Networks

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL 96-98

From: George K Issa
To: Mike Powell, Kevin Martin, Michael Copps, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Wed, Apr 9, 2003 10:05 AM
Subject: Line Sharing

All,

SUNSHINE PERIOD

Reversing the FCC decision eliminating line sharing makes a lot of good sense.

It was/is a decision with zero foundation and zero logic behind it. It is basically indefensible and inexplicable.

You are all politicians and if/when asked for the reasons behind eliminating line sharing, you are unable to come up with one; other than it was "horse trading", and....."we didn't understand what we were doing", and....."it served the needs of the big money rbocs".

Hard to move up the political food chain with that kind of stuff on your "permanent record".

The decision is punitive and arbitrary and victimizes a small company near and dear to the hearts of competitive minded people. And for no good reason. It represents tyranny and failure on the part of you, the FCC.

Reversing this decision makes good sense both from a practical and competitive point of view as well as from a political point of view relative to your future careers.

I am praying that you all do the right thing and reverse this.

Kind regards,
George Issa

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL ~~FILED~~ ~~FILED~~

or 96-98

From: erin wrobel
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, May 1, 2003 12:03 AM
Subject: <No Subject>

SUNSHINE PERIOD

We need to make a stand and let the Bell companies get a fair share for maintaining services for competitors. To have a business sell a product less than it cost to produce it is unimaginable and impossible to run that way for the smallest of businesses. Workers who work for the Bell companies make decent wages and fight for small percentage increases in pay as well for their jobs, while billion dollar long distance companies get breaks in services because they do not spend millions in upkeep and placement of new facilities. I understand we need to promote competition but it is not to anyones advantage to beat up the so far leaders of the industry to lower levels.
Thank you for taking time to read this

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Stuart Gold
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Wed, Apr 30, 2003 8:55 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

SUNSHINE PERIOD

96-88

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero.net) writes:

SBC is suing the state of CA in regards to linesharing. They never wanted to compete from day one. They figure they are big enough to pay all fines you throw at them and this behavior is being rewarded? They are not going to build out FTTH. One company is suffering from this BS, Covad, a facilities based competitor. This makes no sense whatsoever. Not one of you has the cahonies to say this decision is wrong and needs to be changed and that stinks!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 65.59.67.14
Remote IP address: 65.59.67.14

RECEIVED
MAY 06 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

96-98

From: Jeff Bower
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Apr 29, 2003 1:09 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Jeff Bower (jeff.bower@demandmanager.com) writes:

Save linesharing! Save Remote Terminal Access!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.228.216.106
Remote IP address: 12.228.216.106

SUNSHINE PERIOD

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary